



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,679	04/05/2001	Richard E. McNutt	ODS-31	6749

1473 7590 04/19/2004
FISH & NEAVE
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
50TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10020-1105

EXAMINER

JONES, SCOTT E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3713

15

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/827,679

Applicant(s)

MCNUTT ET AL. *cn*

Examiner

Scott E. Jones

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment and request for continued examination filed on January 16, 2004 in which applicant amends claims 1, 14, 16, 27, 29, 40, 58, 76, and 78, submits formal replacement drawings, and responds to the claim rejections. Claims 1-79 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 16, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 12, 27, 36-39, 54, 56-57, 72, and 74-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alcorn et al. (U.S. 6,104,815).

Alcorn et al. discloses a method and apparatus that uses GPS and/or "set-top-box" technology to restrict gaming based on a geographical location. Alcorn et al. additionally discloses:

Regarding Claims 12, 54, and 72:

Art Unit: 3713

- using an integrated receiver decoder to receive blackout information, wherein blackout information indicates geographic regions that prohibit wagering; (Figure 5, Column 7, lines 8-31, and Column 8, lines 26-41); The examiner interprets blackout information to be the geographical locations that wagering is not permitted.
- obtaining location information that indicates geographic location the user equipment is located (Figures 1-9, and Column 3, line 53-Column 4, line 12, Column 5, lines 1-25, and Column 6, line 40-Column 7, line 31); and
- compare the blackout information and the location information at casino server (15) to determine whether the user equipment is located in a geographic location where wagering is allowed (Figures 1-9, and Column 3, line 53-Column 4, line 12, Column 5, lines 1-25, and Column 6, line 40-Column 7, line 31). The examiner interprets blackout information to be the geographical locations that wagering is not permitted.

Regarding Claim 27:

- use an integrated receiver decoder to receive blackout information (Figure 5, Column 7, lines 8-31, and Column 8, lines 26-41); The examiner interprets blackout information to be the geographical locations that wagering is not permitted.
- obtain location information that indicates geographic location the user equipment is located equipment (Figures 1-9, and Column 3, line 53-Column 4, line 12, Column 5, lines 1-25, and Column 6, line 40-Column 7, line 31); and
- compare the blackout information and the location information at casino server (15) to determine whether the user equipment is located in a geographic location where wagering is allowed (Figures 1-9, and Column 3, line 53-Column 4, line 12, Column 5, lines 1-25,

and Column 6, line 40-Column 7, line 31). The examiner interprets blackout information to be the geographical locations that wagering is not permitted.

Regarding Claims 36, 38, 56, and 74:

- restricting wagering access when the user equipment is determined to be in a location where wagering is not allowed (Figures 1-9, and Column 3, line 53-Column 4, line 12, Column 5, lines 1-25, and Column 6, line 40-Column 7, line 31).

Regarding Claims 37, 39, 57, and 75:

- the location information is obtained from a global positioning satellite (Figure 1 and Column 3, line 40-Column 4, line 22).

Although Alcorn et al. discloses using remote terminals to send location information to a casino gaming server to determine whether the remote terminals are in a valid location, Alcorn et al. seems to lack explicitly disclosing:

Regarding Claims 12, 27, 54, and 72:

- comparing the blackout information and the location information at the user equipment to determine whether the user equipment is located in a geographic location where wagering is allowed based on the blackout information. The examiner interprets blackout information to be the geographical locations that wagering is not permitted.

Although Alcorn et al. discloses using remote terminals to send location information to a casino gaming server to determine whether the remote terminals are in a valid location, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to make this determination in the remote user equipment as claimed. In this case, Alcorn's apparatus and the instant invention perform the same function, Alcorn's apparatus makes the location determination in

Art Unit: 3713

the casino gaming server, whereas, the instant claimed invention makes the location determination in the remote user equipment. However, in the specification Applicant describes how the interactive wagering application (including location verification) can be implemented in a network server or on the remote user equipment (Page 7, line 18-Page 8, line 3). Therefore, absence the criticality of the location determination being made in the casino gaming server versus the remote user equipment, the claimed invention is rendered obvious.

5. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-17, 19-26, 28-35, 40-41, 43-53, 58-59, 61-71, and 76-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paravia et al. (U.S. 6,508,710).

Paravia discloses an interactive gaming system that uses a location verification system to determine if a player is in a geographical location that allows wagering. If wagering is allowed, the player is allowed to submit wagering information; otherwise, the player is notified and not allowed to wager. Paravia additionally discloses:

Regarding Claims 1, 40, 51-53, 58, and 69-71:

- determining a geographic location of the user equipment (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40);
- checking whether wagering is allowed in the geographic location of the user equipment (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40); and
- restricting wagering access when wagering is not allowed in the geographic location of the user equipment (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40) .

Regarding Claims 2, 41, and 59:

Art Unit: 3713

- providing wagering access when wagering is allowed in the geographic location of the user equipment (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Regarding Claims 4, 43, and 61:

- determining the geographic location of the user equipment comprises using automatic number identification on a telephone network (Column 19, lines 31-35).

Regarding Claims 5, 44, and 62:

- determining in which geographic locations wagering is not allowed (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40) ; and
- comparing the geographic location of the user equipment with the geographic locations in which wagering is not allowed (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40) .

Regarding Claims 6, 45, and 63:

- using an interactive wagering system and a location tracing service to analyze automatic number identification information obtained from having the user equipment establish a communications link using a telephone network (Column 19, lines 31-35).

Regarding Claim 7:

- using a component selected from a group consisting of a transaction processing and subscription management system, totalisators, a subscription verification facility, and any combination thereof (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Art Unit: 3713

Regarding Claims 9, 47, and 65:

- providing a user with the ability to set user-defined wagering access restrictions (Column 2, lines 13-24, and Column 8, lines 37-54); and
- restricting wagering access based on the user-defined wagering access restrictions (Column 2, lines 13-24, and Column 8, lines 37-54).

Regarding Claims 10, 48, and 66:

- performing a function selected from a group consisting of changing the appearance of wagering options in an interface, removing wagering options from an interface, displaying a message when a wagering option is selected from an interface, suppressing wager-related indicators from appearing on a display, suppressing a wagering event broadcast from being displayed, or any combination thereof (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Regarding Claims 11, 49, and 67:

- receiving blackout information at the user equipment (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40); and
- determining whether wagering is allowed based on the geographic location of the user equipment and on the blackout information (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40) .

Regarding Claims 14 and 76:

Art Unit: 3713

- determining in which geographic location the user equipment is located (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Regarding Claims 15 and 77:

- determining in which geographic location the user equipment is located comprises using the interactive wagering system and a location tracing service to analyze automatic number identification information obtained from having the user equipment establish a communications link using a telephone network (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Regarding Claim 16:

- determine a geographic location of the user equipment (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40);
- check whether wagering is allowed in the geographic location of the user equipment (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40); and
- restrict wagering access when wagering is not allowed in the geographic location of the user equipment (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Regarding Claim 19:

Art Unit: 3713

- a telephone network having automatic number identification functionality that is used to determine the geographic location of the user equipment (Column 19, lines 31-35).

Regarding Claim 20:

- determine in which geographic locations wagering is not allowed (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40); and
- compare the geographic location of the user equipment with the geographic locations in which wagering is not allowed (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40) .

Regarding Claim 21:

- use the interactive wagering system and a location tracing service to analyze automatic number identification information obtained from having the user equipment establish a communications link using a telephone network (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Regarding Claim 22:

- the interactive wagering system is comprised of a component selected from a group consisting of a transaction processing and subscription management system, totalisators, a subscription verification facility, user equipment, and any combination thereof (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Art Unit: 3713

Regarding Claim 24:

- provide a user with the ability to set user-defined wagering access restrictions (Column 2, lines 13-24, and Column 8, lines 37-54); and
- restrict wagering access based on the user-defined wagering access restrictions (Column 2, lines 13-24, and Column 8, lines 37-54).

Regarding Claim 25:

- wherein the user equipment is configured to perform a function selected from a group consisting of changing the appearance of wagering options in an interface, removing wagering options from an interface, displaying a message when a wagering option is selected from an interface, suppressing wager-related indicators from appearing on a display, suppressing a wagering event broadcast from being displayed, or any combination thereof (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Regarding Claim 26:

- receive blackout information (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40); and
- determine whether wagering is allowed based on the geographic location of the user equipment and on the blackout information (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Regarding Claim 28:

Art Unit: 3713

- further comprising a location tracing service to analyze automatic number identification information obtained from having the user equipment establish a communications link using a telephone network (Column 19, lines 31-35).

Regarding Claims 29 and 78:

- determine in which geographic location the user equipment is located (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40); and
- provide the user equipment with a location verification token, wherein the location verification token is provided by an interactive wagering system, and wherein the location verification token is provided when the user equipment is located at a location where wagering is allowed (Column 7, lines 38-46, and Column 21, line 14-Column 22, line 41).

Regarding Claims 30 and 79:

- further comprising a location tracing service to analyze automatic number identification information obtained from having the user equipment establish a communications link using a telephone network (Column 19, lines 31-35).

Regarding Claim 31:

- wherein the user equipment is configured to determine the geographic location of the user equipment (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Regarding Claim 32:

- wherein the user equipment is configured to check whether wagering is allowed in the geographic location of the user equipment (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3,

Art Unit: 3713

lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Regarding Claim 33:

- wherein the user equipment is configured to restrict wagering access when wagering is not allowed in the geographic location of the user equipment (Abstract, Figures 11, 12, and 15, Column 3, lines 11-55, Column 7, lines 38-46, Column 8, lines 12-26, and Column 18, line 8-Column 22, line 40).

Paravia et al. seems to lack explicitly disclosing:

Regarding Claim 1:

- providing the user equipment with a location verification token when the user equipment is in a location where wagering is allowed;
- using the interactive wagering application to verify whether the location verification token is valid; and
- restricting wagering access when the user equipment does not have a valid location verification token.

Regarding Claims 8, 23, 34, 35, 46, 50, 64, and 68:

- the location verification token, stored on the user equipment, expires and is removed after a predetermined period of time.

Regarding Claim 14:

- providing the user equipment with a location verification token, wherein the location verification token is provided by an interactive wagering system, and wherein the location verification token is provided when the user equipment is located at a location where wagering is allowed.

Art Unit: 3713

Regarding Claim 16:

- provide the user equipment with a location verification token when the user equipment is in a location where wagering is allowed;
- use an interactive wagering application to verify whether the location verification token is valid; and
- restrict wagering access when the user equipment does not have a valid location verification token.

Regarding Claim 17:

- user equipment configured to provide wagering access when the user equipment has the location verification token.

Regarding Claim 29:

- wherein the location verification token is stored on the user equipment; and
- restrict wagering access when the location verification token is not stored on the user equipment.

Regarding claims 1, 14, 16, 17, and 29, Paravia's system uses a location verification module to determine the location of the player and determines, based on the location verification data, whether the player can place wagers. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to include a "cookie" on a player's gaming device, such as a computer, to recognize where the (IP address or otherwise) from which the player is accessing the system and to identify the particular player. One would be motivated to place a "cookie" on a player's machine so the player can bypass the entry screen to put the player directly into the system, or to provide the entry screen with the appropriate user name and requesting only password information to facilitate the login process to the wagering system.

Regarding claims 8, 23, 34, 35, 46, 50, 64, and 68 it would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention to have the location verification token (cookie) on a player's machine expire. An expiration date or time is one of the parameters that is configured when creating a cookie. A cookie can expire and then be removed at the end of a session, end of a week, or any other suitable time implemented by a programmer.

6. Claims 13, 55, and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alcorn et al. (U.S. 6,104,815) in view of Paravia et al. (U.S. 6,508,710).

Alcorn et al. discloses that as discussed above regarding claims 12, 27, 36-39, 54, 56-57, 72, and 74-75. Alcorn et al. seems to lack explicitly disclosing:

Regarding Claims 13, 55, and 73:

- the location information is obtained by a location tracing service that analyzes automatic number identification information obtained from having the user equipment establish a communications link using a telephone network.

Paravia et al. teaches of an interactive gaming system that uses a location verification system to determine if a player is in a geographical location that allows wagering. If wagering is allowed, the player is allowed to submit wagering information; otherwise, the player is notified and not allowed to wager. Paravia et al., like Alcorn et al., uses technology to restrict gaming based on a geographical location. Paravia et al. teaches:

Regarding Claims 13, 55, and 73:

- the location information is obtained by a location tracing service that analyzes automatic number identification information obtained from having the user equipment establish a communications link using a telephone network (Column 19, lines 31-35).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to utilize Paravia's location tracing service technology in Alcorn's system to determine a player's physical location. One would be motivated to do so because it facilitates denial of gambling or other transactional privileges to those who are resident at locations or in jurisdictions that would make such transactions illegal.

7. Claims 3, 18, 42, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paravia et al. (U.S. 6,508,710) in view of Alcorn et al. (U.S. 6,104,815).

Paravia et al. teaches that as discussed above regarding Claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-17, 19-26, 28-35, 40-41, 43-53, 58-59, 61-71, and 76-79. However, Paravia et al. lacks explicitly disclosing:

Regarding Claims 3, 18, 42, and 60:

- further comprising a global positioning satellite system to determine the location of the user equipment.

Alcorn et al. teaches of a method and apparatus that uses GPS and/or "set-top-box" technology to restrict gaming based on a geographical location. Alcorn et al., like Paravia et al., uses technology to restrict gaming based on a geographical location. Alcorn et al. teaches:

Regarding Claims 3, 18, 42, and 60:

- further comprising a global positioning satellite system to determine the location of the user equipment (Figures 1-9, and Column 3, line 53-Column 4, line 12, Column 5, lines 1-25, and Column 6, line 40-Column 7, line 30).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to utilize Alcorn's GPS and/or "set-top-box" technology in Paravia's system to determine a player's physical location and blackout information. One would be motivated to do so

Art Unit: 3713

because it facilitates denial of gambling or other transactional privileges to those who are resident at locations or in jurisdictions that would make such transactions illegal.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 12, 27, 36-39, 54, 56-57, 72, and 74-75 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alcorn et al. (U.S. 6,104,815). Applicant alleges Alcorn fails to show or suggest using remote terminals (remote units) to compare location information to receive blackout information (As defined by Applicant, blackout information may include information such as locations in which wagering is restricted (Page 3, lines 3-15)) to determine whether the remote terminals are in a valid location. However, Applicant acknowledges Alcorn uses the remote terminals to send location information to a gaming server to determine whether the remote terminals are in a valid location. Therefore, the examiner has withdrawn the rejection to claims 12, 27, 36-39, 54, 56-57, 72, and 74-75 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alcorn et al. (U.S. 6,104,815) and presents another rejection to Claims 12, 27, 36-39, 54, 56-57, 72, and 74-75 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alcorn et al. (U.S. 6,104,815) above. In this case, Alcorn's apparatus and the instant invention perform the same function, Alcorn's apparatus makes the location determination in the casino gaming server, whereas, the instant claimed invention makes the location determination in the remote user equipment. However, in the specification Applicant describes how the interactive wagering application (including location verification) can be implemented in a network server or on the remote user equipment (Page 7, line 18-Page 8, line 3, Page 2, line 28-Page 4, line 21, Page 22, lines 6-26, Figure 12, and Page 43, line 7-Page 45, line 8). Therefore, absence the criticality of the location determination being made in the casino gaming server versus the remote user equipment, the claimed invention is rendered obvious.

Art Unit: 3713

9. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 1-2, 4-11, 14-17, 19-26, 28-35, 40-41, 43-53, 58-59, 61-71, and 76-79 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paravia et al. (U.S. 6,508,710). Applicant alleges there is not a showing or suggestion that cookies would be provided to the user equipment in response to a determination that the user equipment is in a location where wagering is allowed, nor that such cookies would comprise content that indicates the user equipment is in a location where wagering is allowed. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As previously discussed in Office Action, Paper No. 12, Paravia's system uses a location verification module to determine the location of the player and determines, based on the location verification data, whether the player can place wagers. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the applicant's invention, to include a "cookie" on a player's gaming device, such as a computer, to recognize where the (IP address or otherwise) from which the player is accessing the system and to identify the particular player. One would be motivated to place a "cookie" on a player's machine so the player can bypass the entry screen to put the player directly into the system, or to provide the entry screen with the appropriate user name and requesting only password information to facilitate the login process to the wagering system. In support of the examiner's position, and at Applicant's request, the examiner cites TCP/IP for Dummies to define a "cookie". A cookie is information that a web server sends to your browser when you connect to a site for the first time. Thereafter, the browser returns a copy of the cookie to the server each time it connects. Furthermore, when you accept a cookie you leave behind some information about yourself, such as the name and IP address of your computer. Therefore, the examiner believes Paravia renders the claimed invention obvious.

10. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 13, 55, and 73 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alcorn et al. (U.S. 6,104,815) in view of Paravia et al. (U.S. 6,508,710)

Art Unit: 3713

and the rejection to claims 3, 18, 42, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paravia et al. (U.S. 6,508,710) in view of Alcorn et al. (U.S. 6,104,815) for the same reasons as provided above. Please see item Numbers 8 and 9 above.

11. Applicant's arguments, see the replacement drawings and page 41, filed January 16, 2004, with respect to the objection to the drawings has been fully considered and is persuasive. The objection of the drawings has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott E. Jones whose telephone number is (703) 308-7133. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30 A.M. - 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teresa Walberg can be reached on (703) 308-1327. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott E. Jones
Examiner
Art Unit 3713



sej